

12/16/97
JCSB US PTO

H3097

Q 6A14313

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Ronald A. Kramer Examiner: J. Snay
Serial No: 08/665,491 Group Art Unit: 1313
Filed: 06/18/96 Date: December 12, 1997
For: CONDITIONER, APPLICATOR, AND PROCESS THEREFOR

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D. C. 20231

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Sir:

The undersigned hereby certifies that the attached **RESPONSE TO AN OFFICE ACTON** was mailed to Box Non-Fee Amendment, Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, with sufficient first-class postage, no special handling, on **December 12, 1997**, before 5:00 PM, thereby ensuring that such document(s) will be in the hands of the U.S. Postal Service by the close of business this day. Thus, timely response has been made to the outstanding Office action prior to expiration of the shortened statutory period for the same ending **01/06/98**.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which might be required or credit any overpayment of fees with regard to the attached document(s) to Account No. **08-3150**.

Respectfully submitted,

HUDAK & SHUNK CO., L.P.A.

Samuel Laferty

By: Samuel B. Laferty
Registration No. 31,537

SBL/lb/dp

7 West Bowery Street
Suite 808
Akron, OH 44308-1133
(330) 535-2220

Attorney Docket No.:BAND-A
C:665491.res

12/16/97
J525
U.S. PTO

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Ronald A. Kramer Examiner: J. Snay
Serial No: 08/665,491 Group Art Unit: 1313
Filed: 06/18/96 Date: December 12, 1997
For: CONDITIONER, APPLICATOR, AND PROCESS THEREFOR

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D. C. 20231

O. Lawrence
#6
1.8.98

RESPONSE TO AN OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of October 6, 1997 applicants responds as follows:

REMARKS

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddle in view of Palcher.

Claims 15 to 20 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddle in view of Palcher, as applied to claims 13 and 14 above, and further in view of Bright et al.

Both of the above rejections are based upon the hindsight reconstruction of the invention. None of the references individually teach the subject matter of applicant's claims. The examiner admits that a combination of references is needed to reject the claims. The three references teach different solutions to different problems and there is not a teaching or suggestion in any of the applied references to combine them. Liddle teaches applying an adherent polysiloxane to glass or plastic to impart a soil-repellent feature. Palcher teaches applying polysiloxane oil to a rubber to penetrate and preserve the rubber etc. Bright et al. teaches a glass cleaner. Liddle and Bright et al. are the only references that mention sulfonic acid and they are limited to nonporous surfaces such as glass. Palcher, which is the only reference that teaches rubber, does not use sulfonic acid for the reason that it was not considered necessary or desirable by prior art for use with a porous material such as rubber. According to the prior art, sulfonic acid was only considered as an aid to facilitate the treatment of nonporous surfaces.